## Intergroup Bias

Ji, T.

2020

***document version***
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

# Summary

Following a threat management theoretical approach (Neuberg et al., 2011; Neuberg & Schaller, 2016), the present dissertation investigated how violence and pathogen threats, which are two qualitatively distinct types of interpersonal threats, would differentially influence people's intergroup attitudes.

First, in Chapters 2 and 3, I concentrated on biases against a specific outgroup – immigrants. Chapter 2 examined whether people view male and female immigrants similarly or differently depending on what type of threat they are perceived to pose. I hypothesized that men from a violent origin may pose greater violence threat than women from the same origin, while men and women may be equally contagious if they come from a pathogen-rich origin. Consistent with the hypothesis, internal meta-analyses across three studies (total N = 1488) revealed that people's attitudes toward male immigrants from violent ecologies were more negative than attitudes toward female immigrants from the same ecology. In contrast, attitudes toward male and female immigrants did not differ when those immigrants came from pathogen-rich ecologies.

Chapter 3 focused on pathogen-based outgroup threats, and consisted of studies that investigated whether pathogen avoidance motivations, at both experimental and individual differences level, influenced prejudice toward immigrants indiscriminately (*the generalized outgroup prejudice hypothesis*) or specifically toward immigrants from a pathogen-rich ecology (*the origin-specific outgroup prejudice hypothesis*). Internal meta-analyses across four studies (total N = 1849) lent some support to both hypotheses, but were more in favor of the origin-specific outgroup prejudice hypothesis than the generalized outgroup prejudice hypothesis. Specifically, at the experimental level, people did not show more prejudice towards origin-unspecified immigrants than immigrants from a pathogen-rich ecology, when pathogen avoidance motivation was temporarily activated (via pathogen priming). At the individual differences level, pathogen disgust sensitivity had a unique negative effect on comfort levels with immigrants

from a pathogen-rich ecology, but not on comfort levels with immigrants from unspecified ecologies.

Next, Chapters 4 and 5 focused on the role of women's reproductive hormones (estradiol and progesterone on (a) implicit biases toward threatening faces (Chapter 4), and (b) masculinity preference toward voices (Chapter 5) from ingroup versus outgroup men. In Chapter 4, I tested the hypothesis that the costs for women encountering men posing violence and pathogen threats are different across their menstrual cycle. Thus, women's sensitivity to men posing these two types of threats would vary across the menstrual cycle as a function of their reproductive hormones. Results of a multi-session study on 41 women showed that changes in the E/P (estradiol and progesterone) ratio moderated the difference in women's implicit bias against angry faces and infectious faces. However, inconsistent with our hypotheses, simple effects analyses showed that E/P ratio did not predict bias against male angry or infectious faces independently, and ingroup-outgroup membership did not moderate this effect.

Chapter 5 investigated the moderation effect of group membership on women's masculinity preference, and examined the influences of reproductive hormones on the intergroup masculinity preference (hormonal effect was only tested in Study 5.1). Across three studies, we found that women consistently showed a preference for masculine ingroup men compared to feminine ingroup or masculine and feminine outgroup men. Moreover, this preference was mediated by how good of a father these men were perceived to be. However, inconsistent with our hypothesis, this preference was not influenced by fluctuations in women's reproductive hormones during their menstrual cycle.